

REMARKS

The objection to the Specification has been addressed.

Reconsideration of the objection to the drawings as well as to the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, is respectfully requested. Applicants have made certain non-limiting changes to the claims in an effort to address any informalities. However, the points raised in the Office Action are not of sufficient magnitude to render the claims indefinite. That is, the claims as drafted particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. One of ordinary skill in the art would have understood the metes and bounds of the invention with the claims as originally drafted and certainly now as redrafted.

The objection to the drawing and the rejection based on grounds that the scope of the claims is not comprehensible are interrelated. Applicants take issue with the requirement that the drawings must show multiple presses or that one of ordinary skill in the art would not understand what it is the Applicants are claiming. The written description is extremely clear that the invention is directed to various presses of a press production series. That is, a production series that is complete includes different presses which have standardized parts and bodies and differ only in so far as the gearing. In other words, Applicants are claiming a press which, by virtue of the configuration of its transmission, allows it to be used with different presses in what amounts to a press series much in the same manner that a

vehicle chassie can be used for a variety of different models, e.g., the Toyota Camry and the Lexus.

In summation, there is nothing remotely indefinite or non particular or indistinct about the metes and bounds of the claims when viewed through the eyes of one of ordinary skill in the art.

The rejection of claims 1-4 as being anticipated by Doege et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), and the rejection of claim 5 as being anticipated by Itakura under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are traversed. Reconsideration of each of these rejections is requested. The Doege et al. patent is not directed to a press for using a press series in which the presses all share the same basic structure and differ merely in their transmission characteristic. All that the Doege et al. patent teaches is that the design of the drive unit should be simplified and made more uniform so that it can be easily matched to specific requirements of various performing procedures and productivity. Although the manner in which the ram moves over the press angle may be changed as illustrated in Figs. 8(b) and 8(c), the Doege et al. approach is directed to a single press in which there is no change in the frequency of the ram movement. The Office Action refers to column 4, lines 24-28 of the Doege et al. patent as teaching that a number of presses are identical/uniform in design principles to achieve different stroke/motion of the press ram in multiple identical presses by exchanging the gears of the gear system. In fact, however, the Doege et al. patent rarely mentions that "the number of crank presses identical in design

principles and produced in small runs can be increased". The reference does not address presses of a series in which there are varying stroke speeds as set forth in the claims of the present application.

Similar remarks are applicable to the Itakura patent which also have nothing to do with a press production series in which there are different presses of different stroke speeds. One of ordinary skill in the art knows that a press production series is a group of types of presses in which the members of each type are identical. The presses of different types have a substantial number of common parts and only a few different parts because the manufacturer wants to reduce the number of different parts for manufacturing and inventory purposes. Applicants discovered that this could be achieved throughout all presses of all types of a production series by adding the transmission belonging to the selected press type, that type providing different brand frequencies. All that is required to match the press to a specific task is to select the correct transmission. No other choices are necessary.

The multi-slide machine press disclosed in Itakura has 5 rams and one single main shaft driving all the rams. This is only one press and not a press production series.

Itakura teaches that the rams of the multi-station press can move in off set phases and have different strokes. Likewise, the eccentrics can have different eccentricities, something which is not germane to the present invention. As can be seen from Phase 3 and 4 of the present application, the selection of a different

transmission will lead to both a different ram speed and a different ram force even if the overall press structure shown in Fig. 1 is used. The present invention includes the recognition that any transmission should have the same outer dimension and location of the input and output, irrespective of what gearing and ratio is required.

For the foregoing reasons, it cannot be said that the Doege et al. and Itakura patents anticipate or even render the subject matter of the claims obvious.


Accordingly, early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #852/49038).

Respectfully submitted,

November 26, 2003

For 
James F. McKeown
Registration No. 25,406

CROWELL & MORING, LLP
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
JFM:mld